

that it should have covered a great number of areas in much greater detail, including verification procedures and a number of aspects that have been part and parcel of previous arms control agreements between Russia and the United States, and/or the United States and other parties. Nevertheless, the treaty that was adopted does speak clearly to the aim by the year 2012. Both of our countries will, in fact, have reduced the number of warheads that are viable vehicles of destruction from a level of roughly 6,000 apiece now to somewhere in the 1,700-to-2,200 range.

We will do this on our own schedules, and we will have the protocols of START before us through 2009 and the cooperative threat reduction activity—at least the very visible form of cooperative activity and verification—through that means.

I mention all of that because some Senators have asked both on the floor and off the floor, Is this important to President Bush now? Why is the Moscow Treaty coming up at this particular moment?

I would respond to those questions by saying from the very first meeting the President had with Senator BIDEN, then-chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and me, he encouraged us to move as rapidly as prudent. And we have done so. We pledged to the President that day that hearings would be held. In fact, they were held last year. They were extensive. We have mentioned that hearings were held also in the Armed Services Committee and there were behind-closed-door hearings in the Intelligence Committee, and that both of the other committees shared with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the product of those hearings.

Senators have been on the floor of the Senate as members of those committees and have already testified to the efficacy and the importance of the treaty.

This is the first period of time available on the calendar of the Senate. The majority leader has given this time to our committee with the full cooperation of Senator DASCHLE and Democratic leaders of the Senate. I treasure that fact because I think it is important and it is keeping the faith not only with our President but with the relationship that our President and President Putin have been attempting to forge.

I would simply point out that we have just concluded in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee another extensive hearing on North Korea. There we talked about the importance of a relationship between Russia and the United States. That is a very important relationship. The United States is counting upon Russian friends to be forthcoming with regard to their understanding of the risks that are involved in the Korean peninsula, the risk to Russia, the risk to the United States, and the risk with regard to nuclear weapons throughout the world in

which Russia and the United States have perhaps the greatest responsibility and the greatest stake.

The Moscow Treaty is timely with regard to dialog and diplomacy with the United States and Russia with regard to North Korea. Many hope it may be relevant still with regard to our dialog on the question of Iraq and Resolution 1441 at the United Nations or its successor.

I mention those aspects not with prediction but simply with the relevancy and the timeliness of this debate. I think it is important for us to proceed, if we can, to have a successful conclusion of the debate and a vote on the Moscow Treaty today.

The distinguished Democratic leader has indicated that he perceives this as in the best interests of the Senate. I know our leader feels the same. I simply invite Senators to come to the floor to come forward with their amendments, and we will try to proceed.

I finally add, both Senator BIDEN and I indicated yesterday it would be our hope that amendments would not be adopted to the text of the treaty or its annexes at this point. We believe passage by the Duma, as well as passage by the Senate, in a timely manner is very important.

We understand there are many Senators who wish the treaty had been longer, more extensive, more intrusive with regard to Russian procedures as well as our own, but we have attempted to achieve a great deal. We have much further to go as we negotiate with our Russian friends. Therefore, I hope Senators will not call for bridges that are too far on this treaty and thus jeopardize both its passage here and its implementation by both countries.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I am advised there will not be speakers offering amendments for some time, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:59 p.m., recessed until 2:00 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ALEXANDER).

#### MOSCOW TREATY—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I believe we are considering the Moscow Treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CRAIG. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for no longer than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. I see my chairman here. I want to make sure it is OK with him. It is.

(The remarks of Mr. CRAIG are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 252

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, in a few moments, I will send an amendment to the desk. Before I do so, I will make some general comments on the Moscow Treaty which is before the Senate.

I first wish to congratulate and commend our good friends from Indiana and Delaware for their great work on this treaty. As on so many other issues, they have worked together well in the national interest. The document which is before us, as well as the Resolution of Ratification, represents a lot of significant work on their part. I applaud them for it.

The treaty before us is a modest but a positive step in the United States-Russia relationship. It is particularly important we have this treaty. At some point it was suggested the agreement not be in the form of a treaty. As a matter of fact, the administration finally decided—I think wisely so, and I believe with the support of the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee—that we have a legally binding treaty rather than relying on unilateral steps that are not binding on future administrations and can be easily changed.

Having a treaty ensures that the Senate is going to be able to fulfill its constitutional role, giving due consideration of any treaty and providing advice and consent before ratification.

I view this treaty as a starting point for further nuclear arms reductions and a useful boost to our new and developing and evolving relationship with Russia. There is much more work to be done to continue to improve our mutual security with Russia, and that work includes further reducing our reliance on nuclear weapons, reducing nuclear proliferation dangers, and improving confidence, transparency, and cooperation with Russia on nuclear weapon matters.

This treaty, while important, is also somewhat unusual. Its central obligation is that both nations will reduce their operationally deployed strategic nuclear warheads to a level between